



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

17

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,077	01/08/2002	Michael Wayne Brown	AUS920010687US1	6551
35525	7590	10/31/2007		
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER THOMPSON, JAMES A	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/042,077	Applicant(s) BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner James A. Thompson	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-12, 14-17 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 8, 13, 18 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Sections I and II, filed 15 August 2007, with respect to the rejections under 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections under 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph set forth in the previous office action dated 15 May 2007 have been withdrawn.

2. Applicant's arguments filed 15 August 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Sections III and IV.A: Applicant's arguments demonstrate that the present amendments to the claims overcome Lee (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0075492 A1). However, additional prior art has been discovered which renders the claims obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Accordingly, new grounds of rejection, which have been necessitated by the present amendments to the claims, are set forth in detail below.

Regarding Section IV.B: Examiner did not state that the cited prior art references specifically teach that the user interface comprises a slide bar. Examiner took official notice that a user interface comprising a slide bar is old, well-known and expected in the art, a fact which Applicant did not dispute in Applicant's arguments. Examiner also clearly articulated a reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have had to modify the prior art references to include a slide bar as a part of the user interface. Specifically, a slide bar is a commonly known, user-friendly and intuitive interface by which a user can set a variable value in a computer-based system. However, in the interest of clarity, Examiner has provided a prior art reference which teaches the use of a slide bar and is properly combinable with the previously cited prior art references.

Regarding Section V: New grounds of rejection are set forth below. Additionally, claim 20 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for the reasons articulated below. Also, some of the dependent claims are deemed to contain allowable subject matter for the reasons discussed in the appropriate section below.

Art Unit: 2625

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. **Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.** Claim 20 recites a computer program product, in a computer readable medium, for preventing the computer recognition of data, comprising a plurality of instructions. Claim 20 therefore reads on a text file containing the recited instructions written in a high level programming language ("computer program product"), and stored on a computer disk ("in a computer readable medium"). A text file on a computer disk is non-statutory since a text file is simply non-functional descriptive data. A text file on a computer disk is not a process, machine, article of manufacture, or composition of matter. Thus, claim 20 is non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-3, 5, 9-10, 14-16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0075492 A1) and Hasegawa (US Patent 5,666,191).**

Regarding claim 1: Lee discloses receiving a request to print a document (para. 13, lines 7-13 of Lee); receiving instructions from a user which affect the readability of the text (para. 13, lines 1-7 and para. 17, lines 1-11 of Lee – *user enters commands to separate character/glyph parts (para. 13, lines 1-7) which makes the characters unreadable by optical character recognition (para. 17, lines 1-11)*); automatically determining at least one user preference (para. 13, lines 5-11 of Lee – *glyphs separated by user or computer and stored in memory; when actually printing or displaying, user preference automatically determined based on separated glyphs stored in memory*); modifying the text in the document (para. 13, lines 1-5 and para. 16, lines 1-5 of Lee) based on at least one user preference (para.

Art Unit: 2625

13, lines 1-5 of Lee) so that the text cannot be recognized by a character recognition algorithm (para. 17, lines 1-11 of Lee); and printing the document (para. 13, lines 7-13 of Lee).

Lee does not disclose expressly that said instruction received from the user is a readability value, wherein the readability value is a value within a range indicating a degree of readability of a text; and that said automatic determination is based on the readability value.

Hasegawa discloses receiving a readability value for processing the document image data, wherein the readability value is a value within a range indicating a degree of readability of a text (column 12, line 60 to column 13, line 5 of Hasegawa – *the amount and type of obfuscation is based on the characteristics of the data encountered, which affects the resultant readability of the output document*); and automatically determining at least one user preference based on the readability value (column 12, line 65 to column 13, line 5 of Hasegawa – *preference as to how and to what degree the document is obfuscated is determined automatically*).

Lee and Hasegawa are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely processing document image data so as to obfuscate the resultant print. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a selectable readability value, as taught by Hasegawa, wherein the user enters the appropriate instruction (which would correspond to selecting the readability value in Hasegawa), as taught by Lee. Thus, by combination, the readability value taught by Hasegawa would be received from the user, as taught by Lee. The motivation for doing so would have been to optimally conceal the information according to the type of data contained in the document (column 13, lines 1-5 of Hasegawa), which would be better suited to a selection by a user since a user would better know the purpose of the document, even though such processing would not be as quick as performed such processing automatically. Also, when a readability value (taught by Hasegawa) is used in the context of the OCR obfuscating technique taught by Lee, more uniform results would be achieved than through are achieved through a user individually processing each glyph that is used for later printing. For example, the “A” glyph, when separated by the user, may have a different level of readability than a “Q” glyph separated by the user. But, with a constant readability value applied to each glyph, a uniform level of OCR obfuscation will result. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hasegawa with Lee to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2: Lee discloses that the step of modifying comprises randomizing at least one attribute (para. 19, lines 1-5 of Lee).

Regarding claim 3: Lee discloses that the step of randomizing comprises randomizing the at least one attribute on a character by character basis (para. 15, lines 9-14 of Lee).

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding claim 5: Lee discloses that the at least one attribute comprises at least one of character rotation; typeface (para. 14, lines 3-17 of Lee); font size; character effect (para. 16, lines 1-5 of Lee); and spacing offset.

Regarding claim 9: Lee discloses receiving the at least one user preference from a user (para. 13, lines 1-5 of Lee).

Regarding claim 10: Lee discloses presenting a user interface (para. 13, lines 1-13 of Lee). Since a user can separately treat each of the constituent polygons prior to output on a printer (para. 13, lines 1-13 of Lee), some form of user interface is inherent.

Regarding claim 14: Lee discloses a printer interface, wherein the printer interface receives a request to print a document (para. 13, lines 1-13 of Lee – *print request received, thus some form of printer interface is inherent*); a user interface, wherein the user interface receives instructions from a user which affect the readability of the text (para. 13, lines 1-7 and para. 17, lines 1-11 of Lee – *user enters commands to separate character/glyph parts (para. 13, lines 1-7) which makes the characters unreadable by optical character recognition (para. 17, lines 1-11) – user operates to separate glyphs and perform other functions, thus there is a user interface*); a controller (*corresponding software*), wherein the controller automatically determines at least one user preference (para. 13, lines 5-11 of Lee – *glyphs separated by user or computer and stored in memory; when actually printing or displaying, user preference automatically determined based on separated glyphs stored in memory*); a text modification tool (*corresponding portion of software under control of user interface*), wherein the text modification tool modifies the text in the document (para. 13, lines 1-5 and para. 16, lines 1-5 of Lee) based on at least one user preference (para. 13, lines 1-5 of Lee) so that the text cannot be recognized by a character recognition algorithm (para. 17, lines 1-11 of Lee); and a controller (*corresponding software*), wherein the controller prints the document (para. 13, lines 7-13 of Lee).

Lee does not disclose expressly that said instruction received from the user is a readability value, wherein the readability value is a value within a range indicating a degree of readability of a text; and that said automatic determination is based on the readability value.

Hasegawa discloses receiving a readability value for processing the document image data, wherein the readability value is a value within a range indicating a degree of readability of a text (column 12, line 60 to column 13, line 5 of Hasegawa – *the amount and type of obfuscation is based on the characteristics of the data encountered, which affects the resultant readability of the output document*); and automatically determining at least one user preference based on the readability value (column 12, line

Art Unit: 2625

65 to column 13, line 5 of Hasegawa - *preference as to how and to what degree the document is obfuscated is determined automatically*).

Lee and Hasegawa are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely processing document image data so as to obfuscate the resultant print. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a selectable readability value, as taught by Hasegawa, wherein the user enters the appropriate instruction (which would correspond to selecting the readability value in Hasegawa), as taught by Lee. Thus, by combination, the readability value taught by Hasegawa would be received from the user, as taught by Lee. The motivation for doing so would have been to optimally conceal the information according to the type of data contained in the document (column 13, lines 1-5 of Hasegawa), which would be better suited to a selection by a user since a user would better know the purpose of the document, even though such processing would not be as quick as performed such processing automatically. Also, when a readability value (taught by Hasegawa) is used in the context of the OCR obfuscating technique taught by Lee, more uniform results would be achieved than through are achieved through a user individually processing each glyph that is used for later printing. For example, the "A" glyph, when separated by the user, may have a different level of readability than a "Q" glyph separated by the user. But, with a constant readability value applied to each glyph, a uniform level of OCR obfuscation will result. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hasegawa with Lee to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Regarding claim 15: Lee discloses that the modification means comprises means for randomizing at least one attribute (para. 19, lines 1-5 of Lee).

Regarding claim 16: Lee discloses that the at least one attribute comprises at least one of character rotation; typeface (para. 14, lines 3-17 of Lee); font size; character effect (para. 16, lines 1-5 of Lee); and spacing offset.

Regarding claim 20: Lee discloses a computer program product in a computer readable medium (para. 14, lines 1-6 of Lee) comprising: instructions for receiving a request to print a document (para. 13, lines 7-13 of Lee); instructions for receiving instructions from a user which affect the readability of the text (para. 13, lines 1-7 and para. 17, lines 1-11 of Lee – *user enters commands to separate character/glyph parts (para. 13, lines 1-7) which makes the characters unreadable by optical character recognition (para. 17, lines 1-11)*); instructions for automatically determining at least one user preference (para. 13, lines 5-11 of Lee – *glyphs separated by user or computer and stored in memory; when actually printing or displaying, user preference automatically determined based on separated glyphs stored in memory*); instructions for modifying the text in the document (para. 13, lines 1-5 and para. 16, lines 1-5 of

Lee) based on at least one user preference (para. 13, lines 1-5 of Lee) so that the text cannot be recognized by a character recognition algorithm (para. 17, lines 1-11 of Lee); and instructions for printing the document (para. 13, lines 7-13 of Lee).

Lee does not disclose expressly that said instruction received from the user is a readability value, wherein the readability value is a value within a range indicating a degree of readability of a text; and that said automatic determination is based on the readability value.

Hasegawa discloses receiving a readability value for processing the document image data, wherein the readability value is a value within a range indicating a degree of readability of a text (column 12, line 60 to column 13, line 5 of Hasegawa – *the amount and type of obfuscation is based on the characteristics of the data encountered, which affects the resultant readability of the output document*); and automatically determining at least one user preference based on the readability value (column 12, line 65 to column 13, line 5 of Hasegawa – *preference as to how and to what degree the document is obfuscated is determined automatically*).

Lee and Hasegawa are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely processing document image data so as to obfuscate the resultant print. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a selectable readability value, as taught by Hasegawa, wherein the user enters the appropriate instruction (which would correspond to selecting the readability value in Hasegawa), as taught by Lee. Thus, by combination, the readability value taught by Hasegawa would be received from the user, as taught by Lee. The motivation for doing so would have been to optimally conceal the information according to the type of data contained in the document (column 13, lines 1-5 of Hasegawa), which would be better suited to a selection by a user since a user would better know the purpose of the document, even though such processing would not be as quick as performed such processing automatically. Also, when a readability value (taught by Hasegawa) is used in the context of the OCR obfuscating technique taught by Lee, more uniform results would be achieved than through are achieved through a user individually processing each glyph that is used for later printing. For example, the “A” glyph, when separated by the user, may have a different level of readability than a “Q” glyph separated by the user. But, with a constant readability value applied to each glyph, a uniform level of OCR obfuscation will result. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hasegawa with Lee to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

Art Unit: 2625

7. Claims 4, 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0075492 A1), Hasegawa (US Patent 5,666,191), and Reshef (US Patent Application Publication 2005/0114705 A1).

Regarding claim 4: The combination of Lee and Hasegawa does not disclose expressly randomizing the attribute on a word by word basis.

Reshef discloses randomizing an attribute used to modify text so that the text cannot be recognized by a character recognition algorithm (para. 63, lines 7-11 of Reshef) on a word by word basis (figure 8b(506) and para. 67, lines 12-17 of Reshef). As shown in figure 8b of Reshef, the collection of letters that are distorted can also be used to form a particular word.

The combination of Lee and Hasegawa is analogous art with respect to Reshef because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely modifying rendered text so that the text is recognizable to human viewer but not recognizable to computer-implemented character recognition algorithms. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically randomize the modification attribute on a word by word basis, as taught by Reshef. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent easy reconstruction of the text (para. 67, lines 14-17 of Reshef). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reshef with the combination of Lee and Hasegawa to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

Regarding claim 6: The combination of Lee and Hasegawa does not disclose expressly that the step of modifying comprises at least one of using an uncommon font; introducing a background image or a background color; introducing a gradient film to a background of the document; reversing background and foreground of characters; and reversing background and foreground of portions of characters.

Reshef discloses that the step of modifying comprises at least one of using an uncommon font (figure 7 and para. 69, lines 1-7 of Reshef); introducing a background image or a background color (para. 69, lines 8-14 of Reshef); introducing a gradient film to a background of the document; reversing background and foreground of characters; and reversing background and foreground of portions of characters.

The combination of Lee and Hasegawa is analogous art with respect to Reshef because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely modifying rendered text so that the text is recognizable to human viewer but not recognizable to computer-implemented character recognition algorithms. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to distort the characters, thus producing an uncommon font, and set different colors for the characters, thus inherently requiring some background color (even if white), as taught by Reshef. The motivation for doing so would have

Art Unit: 2625

been to require human sensory ability to determine the text (para. 69, lines 11-14 of Reshef), which thus defeats the use of a computer-based character recognition algorithm. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reshef with the combination of Lee and Hasegawa to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Regarding claim 17: The combination of Lee and Hasegawa does not disclose expressly that the modification means comprises at least one of means for using an uncommon font; means for introducing a background image or a background color; means for introducing a gradient film to a background of the document; means for reversing background and foreground of characters; and means for reversing background and foreground of portions of characters.

Reshef discloses that the modification means comprises at least one of means for using an uncommon font (figure 7 and para. 69, lines 1-7 of Reshef); means for introducing a background image or a background color (para. 69, lines 8-14 of Reshef); means for introducing a gradient film to a background of the document; means for reversing background and foreground of characters; and means for reversing background and foreground of portions of characters.

The combination of Lee and Hasegawa is analogous art with respect to Reshef because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely modifying rendered text so that the text is recognizable to human viewer but not recognizable to computer-implemented character recognition algorithms. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to distort the characters, thus producing an uncommon font, and set different colors for the characters, thus inherently requiring some background color (even if white), as taught by Reshef. The motivation for doing so would have been to require human sensory ability to determine the text (para. 69, lines 11-14 of Reshef), which thus defeats the use of a computer-based character recognition algorithm. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reshef with the combination of Lee and Hasegawa to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

8. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0075492 A1), Hasegawa (US Patent 5,666,191), and Yoshiaki (USPN 7,151,618 B1).

Regarding claim 11: The combination of Lee and Hasegawa does not disclose expressly that said user interface comprises a slide bar.

Yoshiaki discloses a user interface comprising a slide bar (figure 2 and column 9, lines 39-47 of Yoshiaki).

Art Unit: 2625

The combination of Lee and Hasegawa is analogous art with respect to Yoshiaki since they are from similar problem solving areas, namely how to provide user control of image processing for the adjustment of image clarity. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically use a slide bar as part of the user interface, as taught by Yoshiaki. The suggestion for doing so would have been that a slide bar is a convenient format for a user interface for variables which have a range from one end to another. In the context of the combination of Lee and Hasegawa, the slide bar would be used to select the readability value. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yoshiaki with the combination of Lee and Hasegawa to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

Regarding claim 12: Lee discloses that the step of modifying comprises enabling modification techniques (para. 13, lines 1-5 of Lee) and setting modification limits based on the readability value (para. 15, lines 1-9 and para. 16, lines 1-5 of Lee). The user enables, by selection, the modifications that are performed on the polygons of the characters (para. 13, lines 1-5 of Lee). Since the modifications are set by the user, then the modification limits are also clearly set (para. 15, lines 1-9 and para. 16, lines 1-5 of Lee), which are thus based on the readability value (para. 17, lines 1-11 of Lee).

Lee further discloses that modifying further comprises modifying a background associated with the text (figure (310) and para. 16, lines 1-12 of Lee – *the background color of each segment of the text can be modified based on the desires of the user*).

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 7-8, 13 and 18-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 7 and 18 each recite that, within a range between readability and non-scannability, a first set of non-standard fonts is introduced into the text at a first readability value and a second set of non-standard fonts is introduced into the text at a second readability value. Examiner has not found in the prior art the particular features of introducing two different non-standard fonts at two separate readability values. The closest prior art is the combination of Lee and Hasegawa, which are cited in the present office action, and which do not fully teach claim 7 or claim 18. While the combination of Lee and Hasegawa would teach that there is a range of readability values, introducing two different sets of non-standard fonts at two different readability values is not taught by Lee and Hasegawa. Introducing non-

Art Unit: 2625

standard fonts is effective in lowering the readability of the printed characters, and improves the overall functionality to the system. Additionally, a further search of the prior art does not reveal any other references which teach, either alone or by combination, the limitations of claims 7 and 18. Thus, claims 7 and 18, which depend from claim's 1 and 14, respectively, are deemed to contain allowable subject matter. Claims 8 and 19 are deemed to contain allowable subject matter at least due to their respective dependencies from claims 7 and 18. Claim 8 is deemed to contain allowable subject matter at least owing to its dependency from claim 7. Claim 19 is deemed to contain allowable subject matter at least owing to its dependency from claim 18.

Claim 13 recites *inter alia* that "modifying the background associated with the text further comprises: providing a first half of a character in a first color on a first half of the background, wherein the first half of the background is a second color; and providing a second half of the character in the second color on a second half of the background, wherein the second half of the background is associated with the first color, and wherein the first color is a different color than the second color". This particular arrangement of the color of two separate text portions and two separate background portions is not taught by the cited prior art. While Lee teaches that the color and texture of separate text portions can be modified for better OCR obfuscation (see, *e.g.*, figure 3 and para. 16 of Lee), Lee does not teach the particular arrangement of different text and background colors recited in claim 13. The text and background color arrangement recited in claim 13 provides for lower readability and better obfuscation of the printed text, thus improving the effectiveness of the overall system. Additionally, a further search of the prior art does not reveal any other references which teach, either alone or by combination, the limitations recited in claim 13. Thus, claim 13 is deemed to contain allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Thompson whose telephone number is 571-272-7441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JAT
28 October 2007

James A. Thompson
Examiner
Technology Division 2625

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'James A. Thompson', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.